MEMBERS PRESENT:

Douglas Bosco (Public Member), Chair  
Marisa Moret (Public Member)  
Ann Notthoff (Public Member)  
Karen Finn (Designated Representative, Department of Finance)  
Bryan Cash (Designated Representative, Resources Agency)

OVERSIGHT LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

There were no Oversight Legislative members present

OTHERS PRESENT:

Sam Schuchat, Executive Officer  
Pat Peterson, Deputy Attorney General  
Elena Eger, Staff Counsel

1. ROLL CALL

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Moved and seconded: the minutes of the November 8, 2007 public meeting were approved without change, 5-0.

Chair Bosco introduced and welcomed John Papadakis, local restaurant owner and supporter of the Waterfront and Bridge to Breakwater Project, who gave a brief history of the Port and presented his request for improvements and support from the Conservancy.

3. SANTA ANA RIVER PARKWAY
Mary Small of the Coastal Conservancy presented the Staff Recommendation. Speaking in favor of the Staff Recommendation: Orange County Supervisor Bill Campbell, SARTPP Chair; Riverside County Supervisor John Tavaglione; Redlands Mayor John Harrison; David Myers, Executive Director, The Wildlands Conservancy; Celest Cantu, General Manager, Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority; Riverside Mayor Ron Loveridge; Paul Frandsen, Riverside County Regional Park and Open Space District.

Resolution:

“The State Coastal Conservancy hereby authorizes the following disbursements to implement coastal access along the Santa Ana River Parkway in Orange, Riverside and San Bernardino Counties:

1) an amount not to exceed five hundred fifty thousand dollars ($550,000) to the County of Orange for alignment planning, environmental analysis, signage and completion of an engineering report for projects to complete a three mile coastal access trail segment that extends from the Gypsum Canyon Road to the county line;

2) an amount not to exceed one million eight hundred fifty thousand dollars ($1,850,000) to the Riverside County Regional Park and Open Space District for alignment planning, environmental impact analysis, signage, detailed engineering and permit applications for projects to complete a twenty two mile coastal access trail segment from the county line to the Hidden Valley Wildlife Area; and

3) an amount not to exceed three hundred fifty thousand dollars ($350,000) to the County of San Bernardino for alignment planning, signage and environmental impact analysis for a four mile coastal access trail segment that extends from the Waterman Avenue to Alabama Street in the City of Redlands.

This authorization is subject to the condition that prior to disbursement of funds to each grantee, the Conservancy’s Executive Officer shall review and approve in writing a final work program, including a budget and schedule, and any contractors any grantee proposes to employ for the project.”

Findings:

“Based on the accompanying staff report and attached exhibits, the State Coastal Conservancy hereby finds that:

1. The proposed project is consistent with its January 24, 2001 Project Selection Criteria and Guidelines, as updated by the Conservancy on September 20, 2007.

2. The proposed authorization is consistent with the purposes and objectives of Chapter 9 of Division 21 of the Public Resources Code, regarding the establishment of a system of public accessways to and along the California Coast.

3. The proposed project will serve a greater than local needs.”

Moved and seconded. Approved by a vote of 5-0.
4. **RANCHO CORRAL**

Bob Thiel of the Coastal Conservancy presented the Staff Recommendation.

Speaking in favor of the Staff Recommendation: Joe Edmiston, Santa Monica Mountain Conservancy.

Resolution:

“The State Coastal Conservancy hereby authorizes the disbursement of an amount not to exceed two million five hundred thousand dollars ($2,500,000) to the Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority (MRCA) to acquire approximately 320 acres of the Rancho Corral property, consisting of Assessor Parcel Numbers 4457-005-010 and -011, and 4457-013-033, -036, -037, -043, and -044, in the Santa Monica Mountains in Los Angeles County for the purposes of coastal resource enhancement and public access. This authorization is subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to the disbursement of funds for acquisition, the MRCA shall submit for the review and approval of the Executive Officer of the Conservancy all relevant acquisition documents, including but not limited to the appraisal, environmental assessments, agreement of purchase and sale, escrow instructions, and documents of title necessary to the acquisition.

2. The MRCA shall pay no more than fair market value for the property.

3. The MRCA shall permanently dedicate the property for habitat and resource protection, open space preservation, and public access in a manner acceptable to the Conservancy’s Executive Officer.

4. The MRCA shall acknowledge Conservancy funding by erecting and maintaining on the Rancho Corral property, or at another approved location, a sign that has been reviewed and approved by the Conservancy’s Executive Officer.”

Findings:

“Based on the accompanying staff report and attached exhibits, the State Coastal Conservancy hereby finds that:

1. The proposed authorization is consistent with the purposes and objectives of Chapter 6 of Division 21 of the Public Resources Code (Sections 31251-31270 and 31400-31409) regarding resource enhancement and public access.

2. The proposed project has been undertaken at the specific request of the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy, which is the agency having jurisdiction over the project area, consistent with Section 31117 of the Public Resources Code.

3. The proposed authorization is consistent with the current Project Selection Criteria and Guidelines.

The proposed project will serve greater than local needs.”
Moved and seconded. Approved by a vote of 5-0.

5. **SAN CLEMENTE COASTAL TRAIL**

Prentiss Williams of the Coastal Conservancy presented the Staff Recommendation.

Resolution:

“The State Coastal Conservancy hereby authorizes the disbursement of an amount not to exceed five hundred thousand dollars ($500,000) to the City of San Clemente (the City) to assist the City in the construction of the final components of a segment of the California Coastal Trail, known as the San Clemente Rail Corridor Pedestrian Beach Trail, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to the disbursement of funds for construction, the City of San Clemente shall submit for the review and approval of the Executive Officer of the Conservancy:
   a. Evidence that the City has obtained all necessary permits and approvals and has conducted all necessary environmental review.
   b. A final work plan (including the names of any subcontractors to be used in the completion of the project), and a project schedule and budget.
   c. A copy of the License Agreement, dated February 7, 2003 between the City and the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) and other entities with jurisdiction over the railroad right-of-way sufficient to allow the City to build, operate and maintain the project for a period of no less than twenty years and which preserves the public’s right to access the project area in perpetuity.

2. The City shall install and maintain sign(s) on the project site, the design, number and placement of which has been approved by the Executive Officer, acknowledging Conservancy funding participation and identifying the project as a segment of the California Coastal Trail.

3. The City shall implement, or shall cause to be implemented, the mitigation and monitoring measures contained in the City’s Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project.”

Findings:

“Based on the accompanying staff report and attached exhibits, the State Coastal Conservancy hereby finds that:

1. The proposed project is consistent with the Project Selection Criteria and Guidelines, approved by the Conservancy on September 20, 2007.
2. The proposed authorization is consistent with the purposes and objectives of Chapter 9 of Division 21 of the Public Resources Code, regarding public access.

3. The project will serve greater than local needs.

4. The Conservancy and its staff have independently reviewed the City’s Mitigated Negative Declaration, the Mitigation/Monitoring Plan and the public comments (attached to the accompanying staff recommendation as Exhibit 2). The Conservancy finds that the project avoids, reduces or mitigates all potential significant adverse effects on the environment, and that there is no substantial evidence that the project as designed may have a significant effect on the environment as defined in 14 California Code of Regulations Section 15382.”

Moved and seconded. Approved by a vote of 5-0.

12a. EXECUTIVE OFFICER REPORT - LA RIVER STRATEGY PRESENTATION

Chris Kroll and Joan Cardellino gave an update and overview of the LA River Strategy viewing the location through Google Earth.

The following participants gave a brief overview and support of their regional area: Council Member Ed Reyes, City of Los Angeles; Paula Daniels, Public Works Commissioner, City of Los Angeles; Tracy Egoscue, Executive Officer of the Los Angeles Regional Board; Mark Hanna and Mario Acevedo, Los Angeles Dept. of Water and Power.


6. BAY AREA COMMUNITY-BASED ED TRAIL

Jeff Melby of the Coastal Conservancy presented the Staff Recommendation.

Resolution:

“The State Coastal Conservancy hereby authorizes up to one million seven hundred seventy-four thousand six hundred eighty-one dollars ($1,774,681) to be disbursed among 20 nonprofit organizations and public agencies for community-based, educational, environmental restoration and trail projects as follows:

- Acterra: Seventy-two thousand dollars ($72,000) for restoration of the Arastradero Creek Riparian Corridor, Santa Clara County.
- Berryessa Trails & Conservation: Eighty thousand dollars ($80,000) for habitat restoration and trail building in the Lake Berryessa area, Napa County.
- California Department of Parks and Recreation: fifty thousand dollars ($50,000)
for habitat restoration at Half Moon Bay State Beach and Pigeon Point Light Station, San Mateo County.

- California State Parks Foundation: Sixty thousand dollars ($60,000) for wetland restoration and trail building at Candlestick Point State Recreation Area, San Francisco County.
- East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD): Fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) to restore oak savannah habitat on EBMUD watershed lands, Alameda and Contra Costa Counties.
- Friends of Sausal Creek: Thirty-two thousand dollars ($32,000) for habitat restoration and trail building at Dimond Park along Sausal Creek, Alameda County.
- Golden Gate Audubon Society: Ninety thousand dollars ($90,000) for wetland and stream restoration at Arrowhead Marsh at the Martin Luther King, Jr. Shoreline and at Horseshoe Creek, Alameda County.
- Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy: One hundred twenty thousand dollars ($120,000) for riparian restoration at Redwood Creek, Marin County, and trail building at the Presidio of San Francisco, San Francisco County.
- Literacy for Environmental Justice: Ninety thousand dollars ($90,000) for wetland restoration at Heron's Head Park, San Francisco County.
- Marin County Department of Parks and Open Space: Thirty-six thousand one hundred dollars ($36,100) for habitat restoration at Bothin Marsh, Marin County.
- Marin Conservation Corps: One hundred twenty thousand dollars ($120,000) for habitat restoration at Lower Redwood Creek, Marin County.
- Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District: One hundred thousand dollars ($100,000) for habitat restoration and trail work at the Napa River Ecological Reserve, Napa County.
- San Mateo County Department of Parks: Thirty-eight thousand one hundred twenty-two dollars ($38,122) for trail work at San Bruno Mountain, San Mateo County.
- Save San Francisco Bay Association: One hundred twenty-five thousand dollars ($125,000) for habitat restoration at the Martin Luther King, Jr. Regional Shoreline, Alameda County; the Eden Landing Ecological Reserve, Alameda County; San Francisquito Creek, Santa Clara County; Bair Island, San Mateo County; and Santa Venetia Marsh, Marin County.
- Solano Resource Conservation District: One hundred forty-eight thousand six hundred eighty dollars ($148,680) for habitat restoration and trail work at Lynch Creek/Lynch Canyon, Blue Rock Springs Creek/Hann Park, and Vallejo Swett Ranch, Solano County.
- Sonoma Ecology Center: One hundred eighteen thousand eight hundred seventy-nine dollars ($118,879) for riparian restoration at Nathanson Creek, Sonoma County.
- The Bay Institute: One hundred twenty thousand dollars ($120,000) for habitat restoration at Roseland Creek, Tolay Lake and Sonoma Baylands, Sonoma County; Rio del Mar and York Creek, Napa County; and Tomales Bay and Vineyard Creek, Marin County.
- The Pacifica Land Trust: Ninety-seven thousand nine hundred dollars ($97,900)
for habitat restoration and trail work at Pedro Point Headlands, San Mateo County.

- The Watershed Project: Twenty thousand dollars ($20,000) for riparian restoration along San Pablo Creek, Contra Costa County.
- Urban Creeks Council: One hundred twenty thousand dollars ($120,000) for habitat restoration at Rheem Creek, Contra Costa County.
- Urban Creeks Council: Eighty-six thousand dollars ($86,000) for habitat restoration and trail work at Codornices Creek, Alameda County.

Prior to the disbursement of funds to an individual grantee, that grantee shall submit for the review and approval for the Executive Officer of the Conservancy a final work program, schedule, budget, names of subcontractors to be hired, a plan for acknowledging Conservancy funding, and any licensing or other appropriate agreements determined necessary by the Executive Officer for projects restoring natural resources or improving public access on property not owned by the particular grantee.”

Findings:

“Based on the accompanying staff report and attached exhibits, the State Coastal Conservancy hereby finds that:

1. The proposed authorization is consistent with the purposes and objectives of Chapter 4.5, (Sections 31160-31165) of Division 21 of the Public Resources Code, regarding the Conservancy's mandate to address the resource goals of the San Francisco Bay Area.

2. The proposed projects are consistent with the Project Selection Criteria and Guidelines, last updated by the Conservancy on September 20, 2007.

3. Each of the grantees is either: 1) a nonprofit organization existing under Section 501(c)(3) of the United States Internal Revenue Code, and whose purposes are consistent with Division 21 of the California Public Resources Code, or 2) a public agency.”

Moved and seconded.  Approved by a vote of 5-0.

7. **COASTAL TRAIL AT LANDS END**

Joan Cardellino of the Coastal Conservancy presented the Staff Recommendation.

Speaking in favor of the Staff Recommendation: John Skibbe, Associate Director of Planning and Design, Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy.

Resolution:
“The State Coastal Conservancy hereby authorizes disbursement of an amount not to exceed eight hundred fifty thousand dollars ($850,000) to the Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy ("GGNPC") for the purpose of constructing improvements to the Coastal Trail at Land’s End, in the City and County of San Francisco, subject to the following conditions:

1. No Conservancy funds shall be disbursed until the Executive Officer of the Conservancy ("Executive Officer") has reviewed and approved in writing a final work program, including a budget and schedule; a sign plan acknowledging Conservancy funding; and any contractors to be employed in the project.

2. Prior to initiating construction, GGNPC shall provide written evidence to the Executive Officer that all permits and approvals necessary to the implementation and completion of the project under applicable local, state and federal laws and regulations have been obtained.

3. GGNPC shall enter into an agreement sufficient to protect the public interest in the project pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 31116(c).”

Findings:

“Based on the accompanying staff report and attached exhibits, the State Coastal Conservancy hereby finds that:

1. The proposed authorization is consistent with Public Resources Code Sections 31160 31165 regarding resource and recreational goals in the San Francisco Bay Area.

2. The proposed authorization is consistent with the Project Selection Criteria and Guidelines adopted by the Conservancy on January 24, 2001 and September 20, 2007.

3. The GGNPC is a nonprofit organization whose principle purposes are consistent with Division 21 of the Public Resources Code.”

8. **BIG BREAK REGIONAL SHORELINE**

Abe Doherty of the Coastal Conservancy presented the Staff Recommendation.

Speaking in favor of the Staff Recommendation: Jeff Rasmussen, East Bay Regional Park District.

Resolution:

“The State Coastal Conservancy hereby authorizes disbursement of an amount not to exceed four hundred thousand dollars ($400,000) to the East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD) for the design, construction and installation of interpretive exhibits at the Big Break Regional Shoreline, in the City of Oakley, Contra Costa County, subject to the following conditions:
1. No Conservancy funds shall be disbursed until the Executive Officer of the Conservancy (the Executive Officer) has reviewed and approved in writing:
   a. A final work plan, including a budget and schedule;
   b. The names and qualifications of any contractors proposed to be used; and
   c. A signing plan for acknowledging the Conservancy’s funding of this project.

2. Prior to disbursement of any Conservancy funds for construction, the EBRPD shall submit for approval to the Executive Officer written evidence that all permits and approvals necessary to the implementation and completion of the project under applicable local, state and federal laws and regulations have been obtained.

3. The EBRPD shall provide evidence to the Executive Officer that it has implemented or cause to be implemented all the mitigation measures contained in its 2001 Mitigation Monitoring Program for the Big Break Regional Shoreline Land Use Plan and its Mitigated Negative Declaration.”

Findings:

“Based on the accompanying staff report and attached exhibits, the State Coastal Conservancy hereby finds that:

1. The proposed project is consistent with the Project Selection Criteria and Guidelines adopted by the Conservancy on January 24, 2001;

2. The proposed authorization is consistent with Public Resources Code Sections 31160-31165, regarding the Conservancy’s mandate to address the resource and recreational goals of the San Francisco Bay Area;

3. The Conservancy has independently reviewed the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Big Break Regional Shoreline Land Use Plan, prepared by EBRPD and adopted by the EBRPD on October 16, 2001, attached to the accompanying staff recommendation as Exhibit 4, and finds that there is no substantial evidence that the Big Break Regional Shoreline Interpretive Exhibits project will have a significant effect on the environment, as defined in 14 California Code of Regulations Section 15382.”

Moved and seconded. Approved by a vote of 5-0.

9. **WILLOW CREEK**

   Matt Gerhart of the Coastal Conservancy presented the Staff Recommendation.
Speaking in favor of the Staff Recommendation: Brandan O’Neal.

Resolution:

“The State Coastal Conservancy hereby authorizes the disbursement of an amount not to exceed one hundred thirty thousand dollars ($130,000) to Stewards of the Coast and Redwoods (“Stewards”) for the development of engineering designs and environmental documentation for a culvert redesign and channel restoration project in Willow Creek in western Sonoma County, for the purpose of restoring channel connectivity and critical anadromous fish habitat.

This authorization is subject to the condition that prior to disbursement of Conservancy funds, Stewards shall submit for the review and written approval of the Executive Officer of the Conservancy:

1. A final work program, including a budget and schedule.
2. The names of any contractors and subcontractors to be employed for the project.
3. Any permission necessary to pursue the project on the lands of the County.
4. Evidence that all other funds necessary to complete the project have been obtained.”

Findings:

“Based on the accompanying staff report and attached exhibits, the State Coastal Conservancy hereby finds that:

1. The proposed project is consistent with the Project Selection Criteria and Guidelines, last updated by the Conservancy on September 20, 2007.
2. The proposed authorization is consistent with the purposes and objectives of Chapter 6 of Division 21 of the Public Resources Code, regarding enhancement of coastal resources.
3. Stewards of the Coast and Redwoods is a nonprofit organization existing under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Service Code, and whose purposes are consistent with Division 21 of the Public Resources Code.”

10. TALL SHIPS EXPOSITION FESTIVAL OF 2008

Cina Loarie of the Coastal Conservancy presented the Staff Recommendation.

Speaking in favor of the Staff Recommendation: Captain Ray Ashley, Executive Director, San Diego Maritime Museum gave a power point presentation.

Resolution:

“The State Coastal Conservancy hereby authorizes disbursement of an amount not to exceed four hundred fifty thousand dollars ($450,000) in the form of three separate
grants not to exceed one hundred fifty thousand dollars ($150,000) each, to the San Francisco Maritime National Park Association, the Los Angeles Maritime Institute, and the Maritime Museum of San Diego, to plan and host Tall Ships Exposition festivals at the Ports of San Francisco, Los Angeles and San Diego, including but not limited to, the sponsorship of visits by historic tall sailing ships, international maritime training vessels, and other unique craft, and the development of related activities which will promote access to urban waterfronts.”

Findings:

“Based on the accompanying staff report and attached exhibits, the State Coastal Conservancy hereby finds that:

1. The proposed project is consistent with the purposes and objectives of Chapter 7 of Division 21 of the Public Resources Code, regarding urban waterfront restoration.

2. The proposed project is consistent with the Project Selection Criteria and Guidelines adopted by the Conservancy on September 20, 2007.

3. The San Francisco Maritime National Park Association, the Los Angeles Maritime Institute, and the Maritime Museum of San Diego are nonprofit organizations existing under Section 501(c)(3) of the U.S. Internal Revenue Code, and whose purposes are consistent with Division 21 of the California Public Resources Code.”

11. CONSENT

A. SBSP RESTORATION PLANNING

Resolution:

“The State Coastal Conservancy hereby modifies its February 3, 2006 authorization by increasing by up to $114,000 the disbursement to the San Francisco Estuary Institute for technical studies related to mercury contamination in the South Bay from Conservancy funds authorized on September 8, 2005 for the South Bay Salt Ponds Restoration Project and the South San Francisco Bay Shoreline Study.”

Findings:

“Based on the accompanying staff report and attached exhibits, the State Coastal Conservancy hereby finds that:

1. The proposed project remains consistent with Public Resources Code Sections 31160 et seq., regarding the Conservancy’s mandate to address the resource goals of the San Francisco Bay Area.
2. The proposed project remains consistent with the Project Selection Criteria and Guidelines adopted by the Conservancy on January 24, 2001.

3. San Francisco Estuary Institute is a nonprofit organization existing under the provisions the U.S. Internal Revenue Code Section 501(c)(3), whose purposes are consistent with Division 21 of the Public Resources Code.”

B. **LONG BEACH BREAKWATER**

Resolution:

“The State Coastal Conservancy hereby authorizes the disbursement of an amount not to exceed fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) to the City of Long Beach to complete a reconnaissance study to determine if there is a federal interest in a reconfiguration of the Long Beach breakwater. Prior to disbursement of any Conservancy funds, the City of Long Beach shall submit for the review and written approval of the Executive Officer of the Conservancy a final work program, including schedule and budget, for the project; and the names and qualifications of all contractors to be used for the project.”

Findings:

“Based on the accompanying staff report and attached exhibits, the State Coastal Conservancy hereby finds that:

1. The proposed project is consistent with the purposes and criteria in Chapter 6 of the Public Resources Code (Sections 31251-31270, as amended) regarding the enhancement of coastal resources.

2. The proposed project is consistent with the Project Selection Criteria and Guidelines, last adopted by the Conservancy on September 20, 2007.”

C. **HEARN GULCH HEADLANDS**

Resolution:

“The State Coastal Conservancy hereby authorizes the disbursement of an amount not to exceed eight thousand dollars ($8,000) to the Redwood Coast Land Conservancy to construct access improvements at the Hearn Gulch Headlands west of Highway 1 in Mendocino County, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to the disbursement of funds, the Redwood Coast Land Conservancy shall submit for the written approval of the Conservancy’s Executive Officer a work program, budget, names of any contractors it intends to employ for the project, and plans for signs acknowledging the Conservancy and Proposition
12 funding.

2. The grantee shall implement the conditions required for the revised project approved by the California Coastal Commission on April 13, 2007, and the Coastal Development Permit issued by the Commission on July 13, 2007 (attached as Exhibit 2 to the accompanying staff recommendation).

3. The grantee shall enter into and record a public interest agreement under Public Resource Code Section 31116(c).”

Moved and seconded. All consent items were approved by a vote of 5-0.

12. EXECUTIVE OFFICER REPORT

Executive Officer, Sam Schuchat gave an update on meeting Strategic Plan objectives related to climate change. Memo to Conservancy is included with these minutes.

13. DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL REPORT

No report was given. Chair Bosco requested an update on the Sonoma Land Trust lawsuit at the next board meeting.

14. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

There were no board member comments

15. PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments

16. CLOSED SESSION

There was no closed session

17. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 12:05 pm
Report to Board: Re: Progress on Addressing Climate Change

December 11, 2007

Following is a summary of specific actions we have completed, are in process, or will be conducted over the next year. These fall into four categories 1) reducing the Conservancy’s carbon footprint, 2) revising project selection criteria and design, 3) considering new policies to address climate change issues, and 4) supporting science to apply to support project selection and design and policy development.

Deputy Executive Officer, Nadine Hitchcock is overseeing the majority of work and is being assisted by a staff climate committee in early 2008. The committee will help finalize a work program, and staff will be assigned to conducting work. Professional services will be contracted for as needed, such as to assist in measuring our carbon footprint. Nadine is also serving on a Resources Agency Climate Group committee, which includes representatives of all resources agencies and is for the purpose of sharing information and resources to better address impacts from climate change and emissions reductions for their agency. In addition, she is participating on the CA Biodiversity Council steering committee for “Climate Change Implications for Public Land Acquisition and Stewardship” (see #4 under Support Science).

Reducing Agency’s Carbon Footprint

1. Joined the Climate Registry (paperwork submitted). At the start of 2008, we will engage professional services and work with Climate Action Team to measure our carbon footprint, and identify ways to further reduce it.

2. Reducing emissions from travel by:
   • using carpools or buses for tours;
   • leasing a hybrid vehicle for use from Oakland;
   • two additional staff are now working remotely;
   • purchasing use of or ownership of technology such as audio conferencing and teleconferencing; and
   • increasing agency use of phone conferences, where appropriate.

3. Selecting meeting spaces, where feasible that are energy-efficient, promote low-carbon transportation options.

4. Office operations actions to reduce energy use:
   • encouraging staff to reduce printing and use of paper
   • installing light sensors
   • de-activating not needed lights in all offices
   • paper will be 100% recycled paper, PCF

Re-thinking Project Selection Criteria and Design

1. Will recommend new project selection criteria in early 08 for board consideration and adoption to prioritize projects that are 1) carbon neutral or 2) provide carbon offsets (wetlands, trees, etc).

2. Ensure that project designs take sea level rise into account. Staff recommendations are now addressing this.
3. Obtain and apply the best available science to project selection, design, and prioritization with respect to the following types of projects:
   - protection (acquisition) and restoration projects that provide the greatest opportunity for species adaptation and resiliency;
   - anchor watersheds for anadromous species where required water volume and temperatures are likely to be sustainable;
   - escape routes species to adapt to rising water levels along bays and the shoreline;
   - upland corridors to allow for biota to migrate to higher elevations;
   - areas of current geographic or species focus where our there is likely chance of succeeding to protect species; and
   - recreation and access projects that are sufficiently set back from the shoreline and waterway to ensure they will last their expected lifetime.

Future Policy Considerations for discussion with the Board in 2008:

1. Should we require grantees reduce their carbon emissions by:
   - ensuring that buildings we fund get LEED certification, use recycled material and cleaner burning fuels?
   - including a provision in agricultural easements that conservation tillage be applied or that other forms of carbon sequestration be developed?
2. Should we allow protected properties that provide carbon sequestration to be used for mitigation/carbon offsets?
3. Should we purchase property for the sole purpose of tree planting or other forms?

Supporting Science:

1. In February 2008, the OPC will fund a shoreline vulnerability analysis.
2. OPC is currently developing a scope of work for the SCWRP on modeling climate effects on wetlands.
3. In mid-200, the OPC will identify needs for additional research that could be funded by other agencies or entities.
4. The Conservancy will assist the CA Biodiversity Council in funding the CA Council on Science and Technology to identify relevant climate research findings about biodiversity and the impact of climate change, and for a website and other means of communicating information to land-use management and regulatory practitioners.